

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

JACOB HAMMOND, JR.; BOBBY
RAGSDALE,
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

and

HERBERT FOSTER; DOUGLAS
SCROGGINS; KEVIN L. SUTTON;

No. 00-1090

JEROME WARE; AARON WITTS,
Plaintiffs,

v.

HENRICO COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD,
Virginia,
Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond.
Richard L. Williams, Senior District Judge.
(CA-99-218-3)

Submitted: April 13, 2000

Decided: April 24, 2000

Before WIDENER and WILKINS, Circuit Judges,
and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Jacob Hammond, Jr., Bobby Ragsdale, Appellants Pro Se. Phyllis
Audrey Errico, Assistant County Attorney, Joseph Thomas Tokarz, II,

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Jacob Hammond, Jr., and Bobby Ragsdale appeal the district court's order dismissing their action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (1994), 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999), and pendent state law. Their case was referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1994). The magistrate judge recommended dismissing the action and advised Hammond and Ragsdale that failure to file specific objections to this recommendation could waive their right to appellate review. Despite this warning, Hammond and Ragsdale failed to specifically object to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (1994), the district court is required to conduct a de novo review of those portions of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection has been made. The court need not conduct de novo review, however, "when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." Orpiano v. Johnson, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Here, Hammond and Ragsdale made only general assertions and failed to direct the district court to any specific errors in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation.

Because Hammond and Ragsdale were warned of the consequences of failing to file specific objections and because they failed to specify the portions of the magistrate judge's report to which they objected, we find that they have waived appellate review. See United States v.

Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 93-94 (4th Cir. 1994) (failure to file objections waives appellate review). We therefore affirm the district court's order. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED